

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **January 3, 2005**, the examiner reviewed claims 1-25. Claims 1-5, 13-14, 23, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Nakamura (USPN 6,633,873, hereinafter "Nakamura"). Claims 6-12, 15, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamura in view of Harris (USPub 2002/0059204, hereinafter "Harris").

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent claims 1, 14, and 23 were rejected as being anticipated by Nakamura. Independent claims 15 and 22 were rejected as being unpatentable over Nakamura in view of Harris. Applicant respectfully points out that Nakamura teaches **accumulating a given number of responses** (see Nakamura, FIG. 2, S4, col. 5, lines 28-30 and 46-57, FIG. 1, element 9, and col. 9, lines 31-51).

In contrast, the present invention **filters the results** of a remote search based upon organizational procurement controls that include at least one of an upper limit on a price, an upper limit on a quantity, a prohibition against a given supplier, a limit to a given brand, a limit to a given model, a limit on a delivery option, and a limit on payment terms (see page 9, lines 19-25 and page 13, lines 3-9 of the instant application). This is beneficial because it allows the organization to provide these procurement controls on the procurement process even if data must be retrieved from an external source.

There is nothing within Nakamura or Harris, either separately or in concert, which suggests filtering the results of a remote search based upon organizational procurement controls that include at least one of an upper limit on a price, an upper limit on a quantity, a prohibition against a given supplier, a limit

to a given brand, a limit to a given model, a limit on a delivery option, and a limit on payment terms.


Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 14-15, and 22-23 to clarify that the present invention filters the results of a remote search based upon organizational procurement controls that include at least one of an upper limit on a price, an upper limit on a quantity, a prohibition against a given supplier, a limit to a given brand, a limit to a given model, a limit on a delivery option, and a limit on payment terms. These amendments find support on page 9, lines 19-25 and page 13, lines 3-9 of the instant application.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 14-15, and 22-23 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-13, which depend upon claim 1, claims 16-21, which depend upon claim 15, and claims 24-25, which depend upon claim 23, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47,615

Date: February 3, 2005

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95616-2914
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665